DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 868 JC 790 146

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Student Transferability Study Group Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education, Frankfort. |
| PUB DATE | Sep 77 |
| NOTE | 57p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Articulation (Program); *College Credits; College Graduates; Junior Colleges; *Postsecondary Education; *Program Coordination; Proprietary Schools; Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy; Transfers; *Transfer Students; Universities; Vocational Schools |
| IDENTIFIERS | Kentucky |

ABSTRACT

Data regarding transfer and non-transfer students who graduated from four representative Kentucky universities were studied with focus on three issues: program articulation, transfer of credits between different types of postsecondary institutions, and types of potential transfer students. The following problems were revealed: the lack of adequate program articulation between postsecondary institutions of different types, particularly between postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions and the more traditional institutions; the lack of adequate individual course credit transfer and application toward degree programs; and the lack of uniformity among institutions evaluating non-academic or non-traditional experiences for credit in degree programs. Recommendations include: (1) a permanent statewide articulation committee to review and recommend policies and articulation agreements should be established; (2) all institutions need to develop course equivalency guides similar to those currently in use at many institutions; (3) each institution should have a committee for responding to articulation problems; (4) a transferability guidebook should be compiled to explain both institutional and statewide procedures; and (5) mechanisms for the evaluation of credits should be developed. Appendices contain institutional data. (Author/MB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED165868

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

# STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY STUDY GROUP REPORT

SEPTEMBER, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kentucky Council on Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 146

AGENDA ITEM: E-3
Exec. Dir.

# FINAL REPORT OF THE STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY STUDY GROUP

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Council receive for discussion the final report of the Student Transferability Study Group. The report has been referred to the Presidents for institutional response which should be received by Council staff by September 26. At the October Council meeting, staff will propose appropriate action concerning the conclusions and recommendations of the study group.

Background:

At the April 20, 1977 quarterly meeting, the Council approved the appointment of a group to study student transferability. The group consisted of representatives of the eight public universities, the University of Kentucky Community College System, the independent institutions, the postsecondary vocational/technical system, the proprietary institutions and the Kentucky Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Beginning with its first meeting on June 13, the group met five times in full committee and completed its report on September 1. Receipt of this report permits time for institutional review and Council discussion of the conclusions and recommendations of the group prior to the October Council meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| ABSTRACT | I-III |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| ISSUE IDENTIFICATION | 3 |
| STUDY PROCEDURE AND FINDINGS | 9 |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 22 |

APPENDICES

A. Agenda Item D-2, Student Transferability Between Institutions

B. Western Kentucky University, Department of Industrial Education and Technology, College of Education, Proposed Guidelines for Cooperative Associate of Science Degree in Printing Technology

C. Council on Public Higher Education, Student Transferability Study Group Agenda, June 13, 1977

D. Transfer Student Information

E. Study Group Membership

## ABSTRACT

The Study Group investigated a wide range of issues and concerns about the transfer of students among the postsecondary degree-granting collegiate institutions in Kentucky and identified three major issues: program articulation; transfer of credits between different type postsecondary institutions; and different types of potential transfer students. Based upon study and research of these and related issues, the Study Group reached the following conclusions:

Conclusions

1. There is a problem resulting from the lack of adequate program articulation between postsecondary institutions of different types -- particularly between postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions and the more traditional institutions.
2. There is a problem resulting from lack of adequate individual course credit transfer and application toward degree programs between postsecondary institutions of different types -- particularly between postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions and the more traditional institutions.
3. There is a problem resulting from lack of uniformity among institutions in evaluating non-academic or non-traditional experiences or competencies for credit in degree programs.

To address these and related problems, and to insure maximum student transferability among the postsecondary institutions in the Commonwealth, the Study Group makes the following recommendations:

Recommendations

1. The Council on Higher Education should establish a permanent Statewide Articulation Committee to recommend policies and

procedures to the Council for the improvement of program articulation and student transferability among the post-secondary institutions in Kentucky. The principal functions of this committee would be to -

(a) review existing policies and procedures and possibly recommend new policies and procedures to facilitate transferability of credit;

(b) promote and review program articulation agreements among the various types of postsecondary institutions in Kentucky.

The proposed membership and additional duties of this committee are described in the report. (See pp. 23-25)

2. All institutions are to develop course equivalency guides similar to those currently in use at many institutions. These guides (a) should be developed between institutions having transfer activity in the past; (b) should be developed between institutions which should have or expect to have future transfers; and (c) should result ultimately in including course equivalencies on a statewide basis. (See p 25)

3. Each institution should have a mechanism for responding to articulation problems, such as a council, committee or panel. This mechanism would permit the institutions to refine further their transfer policies and procedures and their academic counseling as well as to provide an avenue for student appeals. (See p 25)

4. A transferability guidebook should be compiled and maintained by the Council on Higher Education to explain the transferring

process from both statewide and institutional perspectives. Specifically, it should distinguish among the various types of postsecondary institutions and their purposes, goals and accreditation. It should discuss transfer considerations resulting from these differences. The guidebook should set forth transfer policies and procedures and degree requirements for each Kentucky institution. (See p 25)

5. The institutions, with the cooperation of the Council on Higher Education and the State Board for Proprietary Education, should develop mechanisms for the evaluation of credits from any college which is accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Office of Education and licensed to offer standard college degrees in Kentucky. Once these mechanisms are developed, they can be used to evaluate credit from other types of postsecondary institutions. (See p 26)

## INTRODUCTION

In response to the Council on Higher Education's charge to investigate "student transferability", the Student Transferability Study Group considered a wide range of possible problem areas as well as methods of improving the process of transferring credits and experiences to and between institutions at the college level. An appreciation for the breadth of items investigated may be gained by viewing Appendix C, but even this first meeting agenda does not reflect additional investigatory areas explored such as transferability and the postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions, the evaluation of life experiences, upside down programs, and 2 plus 2 programs.

The sequence of the group's deliberations included (1) an assessment of the total problem including both that part which is real and that part which is perceived on the part of those not understanding the system, but who are affected by it,* (2) the assignment of research areas to subcommittees to place in perspective the magnitude of the potential transferability problems based upon the number of transfer students, the records of transfer students versus non-transfer students, and particular areas of concern regarding total transferability of credits versus acceptance of credits for general education or major programs, and, finally, (3) the drawing together of this information into conclusions and related recommendations.

It is important to note that the recommendations set forth are not

---

*Even though much of the problem was found to be perceived or inaccurately assessed, the Study Group feels that this in itself is a problem resulting from the lack of proper dissemination of present policies and procedures.

the only alternatives, but they do represent the best balance as they should effectively produce the desired results without resulting in undue cost or the derailing of an already responsive and effectively run educational system, or in essence, reflect an overreaction.

Finally, two items on the initial agenda were considered to be best handled separately and by other bodies. These included transfer credit considerations at the graduate level and the desirability of a standardized transcript form. Since the former, the transfer of graduate credits, reflects a distinctively different problem due to program length, program requirements, and the numbers involved versus the undergraduate level, it was considered better to refer this problem to the graduate deans of Kentucky's higher education institutions.

With respect to a standardized transcript form, the Kentucky Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers could address the problem more knowledgeably than this study group, as it is essentially a non-academic problem. If it were found, however, that such standardization were desirable, it is hoped that the subsequent transition to the new form would be staged with a late target date for completion so as to minimize the cost and associated wastes which would occur if present materials were not completely utilized.

## ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

The primary charge to this Study Group was "to study and identify current issues concerning student transfers between institutions, to review institutional policies and procedures related to student transfers, and to consider mechanisms for improving the transferability of students." As noted in the Introduction, much of the Group's effort was devoted to the identification of issues and problems associated with student transfer. Further, the Group has tried to define these issues and to assess the severity of the problems represented by each.

The Study Group identified three major issues in student transferability:

-Program articulation

-Transfer of credits between different type postsecondary institutions

-Student transfers

It should be clearly stated, while enumerating the major issues, that there are lesser issues which fall naturally under these major headings and which will be addressed. In particular, although not discussed in this section, the need for data dissemination to eliminate perceived rather than real problems is explored later in this report. For the moment, a sequential discussion of each of the above major issues is in order.

Program Articulation. Program articulation is considered by the Study Group to be the single most important issue. This term, as opposed to "student transfer," refers to systematic, planned agreements between institutions so that students may move from one academic objective to another with ease and with appropriate recognition of work previously completed.

Such agreements require close coordination, cooperation, and communication between institutions so that program requirements are clearly stated and readily available to students.

There are, of course, a number of these "articulation agreements" in effect at the present time. For example, several schools participate in "3 + 2" engineering programs in which a student may begin an engineering program at one institution and transfer to another for its completion. Other examples would be the so-called "ladder concept," such as Dental Assistants advancing to Dental Hygienists, and the "program evaluation concept" where specific programs are evaluated to determine equivalency of credit for transfer to other postsecondary or higher level educational institutions. Despite these agreements, more could and should be done, particularly in the area of program articulation between and among postsecondary vocational, proprietary and two and four year degree-granting institutions. (See page 23.)

As noted earlier, for a variety of reasons the Study Group believes the expansion of program articulation agreements on a systematic basis is the single most important issue of the three given earlier. In the first place, it is academically sound to recognize a student's knowledge and skills even if they were not gained through traditional means or through traditional program sequencing. When such recognition can be granted on a systematic program basis rather than by review of each student's credentials, the transfer process is smoothed and education becomes more accessible to all.

Another reason for attaching importance to such articulation agreements is that they provide options to the student at each milestone in his/her academic career. For example, at graduation a vocational school student might

choose employment or further education. With the growing national recognition that education is truly a lifelong process and with the increasing tendency of people to return periodically for further education, it is important that institutions of higher education plan programs with these facts in mind. Articulation agreements are seen as one means of facilitating this planning.

The third reason that such agreements are important is that they allow students, in some cases, to begin their educational careers closer to home. Thus, both the expense of attending college and the cultural shock experienced by many beginning students can be reduced significantly.

Transfer of Credit Between Different Type Postsecondary Institutions. Within Kentucky there are several collegiate postsecondary institutions which are not members of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Nevertheless, some of these institutions are accredited at the college level by agencies recognized to accredit collegiate institutions by the United States Office of Education.

Most of these schools have a more narrowly defined mission than do many of the comprehensive colleges accredited by the Southern Association. In the past, Southern Association member schools have not, in general, accepted credits from such institutions. Most Southern Association members have some process through which students from non-regionally accredited schools may validate previous work. The most typical method of validation is the "challenge exam." Another frequently used method is to require the student to complete a certain number of advanced credits with satisfactory grades. Then previous credits can be accepted retroactively.

The real issue is whether present methods of credit validation are adequate or is it desirable to develop a more systematic approach to this

process. Whatever future credit validation mechanisms might develop, it is necessary that they take into account both the expectations of the Southern Association and the right of each institution to set its own requirements for the degrees it awards.

Student Transfers. There are three types of potential student transfers which include:

1. the student who enters one institution with the knowledge that he or she must transfer to another to complete a particular program;

2. the student who transfers for personal reasons unrelated to academic objectives, or who changes academic objectives, and

3. the student who does not transfer because the receiving institution has judged his previous program to be unacceptable.

The first type of transfer is important because it involves many community/junior college students and others who wish to begin their college work close to home. Research done by members of the Study Group does not support the contention that loss of credits by these students moving between institutions of the same type is a widespread problem. In fact, comparisons of numbers of credits earned by resident and by transfer students at the time of graduation show no significant difference between the two groups. Of those students who had lost credit upon transfer, the cause was usually one of the following:

-Lack of adequate counseling at the sending institution

-Failure on the part of the student involved to familiarize himself with requirements of the receiving institution

-A change in degree objectives on the part of the student

-Voluntary accumulation of credits beyond those required for the degree

The second type transfer student is more likely to lose credit because the transfer is not planned. Further, students in this category may have completed specific program requirements at one institution which are not applicable to their program at the other. While institutions attempt to accommodate such students, program substitutions normally are granted only to the extent that they would be allowed to resident students.

The third type of transfer student is, often, not truly a transfer student as he either fails in his attempt to transfer credit or opts not to attend the college under consideration. This student is one who has possibly been attending a proprietary or vocational school and then decides to transfer to a college of another type -- one whose mission differs from that of the school he has been attending. While this has been partially addressed under Program Articulation and Different Type Institutions, it extends beyond these categories. It is recognized that it may be desirable for program articulation agreements to go further and address course-by-course acceptance or rejection with the proper reservations concerning institutional autonomy and accreditation expectations as noted on pages 5 and 6.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the same type of accreditation alone does not guarantee the transfer of course credits -- that mission and program goals can often result in legitimate rejection of course credit transfer by the receiving institution. Therefore, this problem may not apply only to proprietary and vocational schools, but to other schools, particularly to those with innovative programs which may tend to reverse course

sequences (upside down programs).

The magnitude of the problem of this third category of student is difficult to measure since the number of students electing not to apply for transfer is not available. Those who unsuccessfully tried to obtain credit are unidentified also. However, the general consensus does indicate that the number of students desiring to transfer is increasing yearly. The Study Group recognizes this problem as being of major concern; therefore, the central thrust of the conclusions and recommendations are directed to this third category of students. (See pages 22-26)

## STUDY PROCEDURE AND FINDINGS

The Study Group performed some tasks via assignments to subcommittees and some tasks in combined sessions -- the latter sessions normally accepted, discussed, modified, and approved or rejected the reports of the subcommittees.

Three subcommittees were formed to -

1. establish the magnitude of the transferability problem numerically (Research Subcommittee);

2. address the problem of program/credit articulation between postsecondary institutions of different types (Postsecondary Vocational and Proprietary Institution Subcommittee) and;

3. study the transfer of credits between postsecondary institutions of the same type with emphasis on the total transferability of credits, the transfer of courses for general education credit, and the transfer of courses for major program credit (Credit Transfer Subcommittee).

### Research Subcommittee

The major thrust of the Research Subcommittee was to determine the magnitude of the problem from a numeric perspective. This was accomplished in a direct manner by evaluating transfer versus non-transfer students who graduated from four representative Kentucky Universities of the type which are the logical recipients of transfer students. Criteria guiding the collection of data were established consistent with the objective -- namely, do transfer students really suffer from the transfer process -- or putting it another way, do we really have a problem? The best way to answer this was to compare the total number of hours completed by transfer students in order to earn their degree versus the number of hours needed by non-transfer students. The following ground rules were established in order to make the data comparable among the four institutions:

1. Non-transfer students selected were in residence for all of their work at the institution, or transferred less than the equivalent of one academic year to the institution.

2. Transfer students had transferred an equivalent of at least one academic year to the institution.

3. Only students transferring from Kentucky institutions were included in the sample.

4. All transfer students meeting the above criteria were included in the population.

5. A random sample of non-transfer students was made for purposes of comparison.

6. A difference of 6 semester hours or more between the two groups would be considered significant because it could result in additional time for the student to complete the program.

7. The data on transfer students were subdivided into four categories -- public and independent, two and four-year institutions.

8. All college-level hours earned at the sending institution were included in the total for the purposes of the study.

The basic findings of these four reports are summarized below, while a more complete set of supporting data appears in Appendix D.

I. NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFER STUDENTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF NEW STUDENTS, FALL, 1976

| Institution | # First Time Freshmen | # Transfer Students | Total New Students | Transfer Students As % of New Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Morehead State University | 1523 | 393 | 1916 | 20.51% |
| *Murray State University | 1909 | 522 | 2431 | 21.47% |
| **University of Kentucky | 3199 | 1503 | 4702 | 31.96% |
| *Western Kentucky University | 2907 | 731 | 3638 | 20.09% |

II. AVERAGE TOTAL HOURS FOR UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFER STUDENTS AND NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS TO COMPLETE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

| Institution | Minimum Hours Required for Graduation | Average Total Hours for Non-Transfers | Average Total Hours for Transfers | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Morehead State University | 128 | 132.6 | 137.7 | 5.1 |
| Murray State University | 128 | 135.1 | 135.9 | 0.8 |
| University of Kentucky | 120 | 124.8 | 128.7 | 3.9 |
| Western Kentucky University | 128 | 137.2 | 136.5 | -0.7 |

*Total Sample
**30% Sample

III. AVERAGE TOTAL HOURS FOR UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFER STUDENTS TO COMPLETE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS BY TYPE OF SENDING INSTITUTION

| Institution | Average Total Hrs for Non-Transfers | 2 Year Public | 2 Year Independent | 4 Year Public | 4 Year Independent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Morehead State University | 132.6 | 135.8 | 135.5 | 137.7 | 146.1* |
| Murray State University | 135.1 | 135.7 | - | 136.6 | 137.2 |
| University of Kentucky | 124.8 | 127.5 | - | 130.6 | 130.1 |
| Western Kentucky University | 137.2 | 137.6 | 133.6 | 136.5 | 136.1 |

*Based on 8 transfer students

Two sets of conclusions can be drawn from these data and from other known facts. The first set includes the following:

1. The number of transfer students commonly handled by the typical four-year, postsecondary institution is approximately 20 percent of all new students at regional institutions and 31% at the University of Kentucky in a given year.

2. Overall, the transfer problem, though it may loom large to an individual student at a point in his career, is not a significant problem. Transfer students take less than six additional credits, compared with non-transfers, in order to graduate.

The second set of conclusions are less directly associated with numbers, but they are very real for those associated with either the business of transfer of educational credits or for those receiving complaints involving individual transfer problems.

1. These data suggest that a few students may have problems which should be solved.

2. However, these data do not reflect either those students who were denied sufficient credit acceptance from the receiving institution, resulting in their decision not to transfer, or those students who were aware of credit acceptance policies and did not apply to have their credits evaluated. Those students, it was found by the latter two subcommittees, were not students transferring from traditional programs between institutions of the same type but were students attempting to transfer from vocational or proprietary postsecondary institutions, or from institutions of the same type which had developed non-standard programs or course sequencing. The magnitude of this problem has not been assessed.

Final Conclusions: The two prior sets of conclusions can be synthesized into a meaningful set of observations upon which knowledgeable recommendations

can be made and subsequently acted upon.

1. The transfer of students between traditional, postsecondary institutions of the same type presents few problems, although students sometimes do perceive problems due to the lack of easily available information.

2. An undetermined number of potential transfer students may not be accommodated by the present transfer policies at most postsecondary institutions. Regardless of the absolute number, mechanisms need to be considered to ease this problem.

3. Recommendations made and mechanisms developed to solve the real and perceived problems in the area of student transferability should be separate, and each set of recommendations should be consistent with the direction and magnitude of the problems to be resolved.

Postsecondary Vocational and Proprietary Institution Subcommittee

The subcommittee assigned the vocational and proprietary institution credit transferability problem, as was noted earlier, had less hard evidence to build upon. Nevertheless, this subcommittee had strong representation from these institutions as well as from the traditional, four-year, postsecondary institutions. Therefore, it was demonstrated that a growing problem exists.

Despite the early identification of the main problem elements, the acceptance of a common proposal from which to develop mechanisms for the resolution of the problem proved difficult. Probably the best approach herein is to include the bulk of the subcommittee's report to the main committee. It should be pointed out clearly, however, that the recommendations contained in this subcommittee report are preliminary, and that the final conclusions and refined recommendations of the main committee are part of the last section of the parent document.

The Subcommittee met in Louisville on June 20, 1977. Four basic issues were discussed:

1. Transferability of credits earned at institutions which are not regionally accredited.

2. Transferability of credits earned at vocational-technical schools in Kentucky.

3. Development of "Ladder" programs between the Vocational schools and other Postsecondary institutions.

4. Development of "2 + 2" programs between junior or community colleges and four-year institutions.

The first issue consumed most of the meeting and was the most difficult to deal with. One suggested option was that regionally accredited institutions should recognize credit from schools which hold other types of accreditation when the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools recognizes and establishes reciprocity with other accrediting agencies. The Subcommittee generally felt this solution was unsatisfactory for two reasons. First, the Southern Association may not have the ability nor the desire to take on this task. Further, the problem is "local" and should not be referred to an outside agency for solution.

Two other proposals were discussed. The Subcommittee did not endorse either unanimously but decided to put them before the full membership for consideration. The full membership approved this proposal:

- With the cooperation of the Council on Higher Education and the State Board of Proprietary Education, public institutions should develop mechanisms for the evaluation of credits from any college which is accredited by an agency recognized by the US Office of Education and licensed to offer standard college degrees in Kentucy.

With regard to the issues concerning the vocational-technical schools, it was suggested that other institutions shoyld not reject credits from these schools out of hand and asked that some kind of program evaluation be conducted. After some discussion the Subcommittee made a recommendation that was adopted by the full committee.

- A Statewide Transferability Committee is proposed and should be charged with fostering program articulation agreements between the postsecondary vocational/technical schools and other institutions of higher education. This Committee should examine programs to determine possible linkages and encourage institutions to develop "ladder" programs leading to Associate or Baccalaureate degrees which appropriately recognize work done at vocational schools.

The Subcommittee made a similar recommendation concerning program articulation between the so called "terminal" associate degree and the baccalaureate degree.

The important difference between what is now possible and what is recommended is that a statewide group would have the positive responsibility to develop appropriate program articulation agreements.

It should be emphasized again that final recommendations of the main committee appear under the Conclusions and Recommendations of this report. Further, the problems of institutions of the same type having non-standardized programs would be included with any recommendations which pertain to vocational and proprietary schools.

Credit Transfer Subcommittee

The Credit Transfer Subcommittee, which was charged with exploring in depth (1) the total transferability of credits between the traditional postsecondary institutions of the same type, both state-supported and independent, (2) the transfer of general education courses from the sending institution for credit in the receiving institution's general education program, (3) the transfer of courses in the student's major completed at the sending institution for credit toward the degree program at the receiving institution, and (4) the review of alternative mechanisms which could be implemented in order to smooth potential transfer problems.

This subcommittee arrived at the conclusions presented below. These were based upon a review of procedures presently used at state-supported and independent postsecondary institutions in evaluating transcripts and upon the fact that transfer students are treated in a manner comparable to the receiving institution's non-transfer students; therefore, no extra demands are made on the transfer students. While there is no doubt that institutions operate differently, the similarities of their procedures are much more apparent than are their differences. The following represents the conclusions of the subcommittee.

1. There is virtually no loss in total transferability of credits (assuming a 2.0 overall grade point average) between traditional postsecondary institutions of the same type.

2. There is a perceived loss of credit by some students

when they interpret the lack of applicability of a specific course toward a receiving institution's general education requirements or major degree program. However, even when this may be the case, the course does transfer as an elective credit which can be applied toward the total hourly requirements for degree attainment. (As was established by the Research Subcommittee, the comparability of the total hours required for degree attainment of transfer versus non-transfer students indicates that there are no significant losses.)

3. The procedures presently used by these institutions to evaluate courses to be credited toward the completion of general education and major programs are consistent with good academic practices and are within the normal prerogatives of the institutions. These procedures do not work a hardship on transfer students.

4. Most students who do experience a real problem or who do perceive a problem, experience these difficulties as a result of either not understanding the procedures (partially an institutional failure mentioned earlier), because they did not plan properly for the transfer, or because they failed to accept proper academic advice.

As in the case of the Postsecondary Vocational and Proprietary Institution Subcommittee, the major portion of the subcommittee's submitted report should be presented prior to elaborating on the main committee's expanded discussions, particularly regarding some alternative corrective mechanisms.

## Transfer of College Credit

There are three major considerations when reviewing the transferability of college credits between institutions of higher learning. These include (1) the basic transfer of satisfactorily completed courses, (2) the acceptance by the receiving institution of the general education program (or liberal arts program) or courses taken at the prior school, and (3) the acceptance of credit earned in the student's major program by the department responsible for that program at the receiving institution. Each of these will be addressed in sequence.

### Basic Transfer of Credits

Except for special cases such as students transferring from proprietary or vocational institutions (both of which will be covered separately), there is little or no loss of credit hours when a student transfers to any of the state-supported and independent institutions within the state providing that the student receives a passing grade in the course(s)(Based on a 2.0 overall average). In addition, most colleges accept the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and make provisions for credit for knowledge acquired in a nonstandard method (principally through testing). Therefore, no major concerns exist in this area.

While there are no major problems in the transfer of students between Kentucky institutions, these transitions could be eased and the spirit of cooperation strengthened by the following:

1. A program of counseling by the sending and the receiving institutions;
2. A committee at each institution for the consideration of transfer problems and appeals;
3. Course equivalency data;
4. A uniform policy on the acceptance of 'D' grades in transfer - credit of 'D' grades will be accepted in transfer when credit is granted for 'D' grades for equivalent courses completed in the receiving institution.

### Acceptance of General Education Coursework

All institutions of higher education have consistently felt that an educated person is one who has acquired a broad background as well as special competence in his chosen field of endeavor. In fact, most academicians feel that the completion of the first goal, the broad background, is a sacred trust with which they have been charged.

The achievement of this goal, normally called general education or liberal arts education, usually can be clearly defined although the implementation of a program designed to afford this background for students may vary considerably. These variations exist not only from school to school, but from time to time within the same institution. In other words, in an attempt to achieve a sound general education program, each institution is continually evaluating and improving their program. However, the development and/or changing of a program must take into consideration (1) the philosophical viewpoint of the faculty involved, (2) enrollment patterns, (3) staffing patterns with respect to the first two items, and (4) the physical facilities available.

Considering these factors, it is recommended that 'easing the acceptance' of general education courses could be accomplished through the wise evaluation of programs/courses already completed by the student by the receiving institution. This approach, outlined later in this text, is suggested rather than attempting to develop a standardized general education program throughout the state, possibly even to the standardization of course numbering. Some of the reasons for not considering these alternatives include the following:

1. A standardized program throughout the state would usurp a desirable prerogative of each institution. It should be kept in mind that these institutions develop programs which they consider to be the ultimate in a general education program consistent with their faculty expertise, their facilities, and in tune with possible regional characteristics and needs.

2. Possibly most important, basic programs autonomy permits every institution to review and improve their educational programs, including general education. As new concepts/procedures are put into practice they are generally reviewed by many institutions and are thus used directly to improve programs at these institutions or prompt them to review and improve their own programs internally. The willingness of a faculty member or a program director to be innovative would indeed be limited in a standard state program knowing that he had to work against the momemtum of an almost unwieldy group of institutions/faculty before he could accomplish change, even on a trial basis.

What the Committee does recommend is the following with respect to the evaluation of general education courses by reviewing institutions.

1. In general, institutional policies for evaluation general education courses are acceptable; however, as a minimum all courses which can be equated to the receiving institution's general education courses should be counted toward the receiving institution's general education program. Also, all courses receiving general education credit at the sending institution should be allowed general education credit at the receiving institution.

2. All institutions should have a committee concerned with articulation to review individual cases which either do not fall neatly under the above broad guidelines, or those cases which may be challenged by the transferring student.

3. Information on transferring procedures for each institution, general education programs at each institution, and course equivalencies should be readily available to all institutions and students.

Major Program Credit Acceptance

Except where agencies, such as accrediting or certifying bodies, may require specific courses or course complexes, the Committee feels that major programs should be controlled by each institution. The strongest argument for this statement lies in Item 2 under General Education, coupled with the fact that individual departments often have particular orientations which uniquely prepare

students in a special area of a discipline. However, exchange of information as noted earlier under General Education would be beneficial to transfer students, as would a general agreement that transfer students be given every consideration by receiving departments.

Since lower division courses tend to be similar in institutions across the state, there appears to be little concern in the transfer acceptance of these courses in a major program. Generally, the problem of acceptance of major program courses is the most acute in programs that are closely structured, such as in the physical sciences and in the nursing programs. This is particularly true of the last two years.

Cross Registration

Finally, since the transfer of basic credits poses no significant problems at present, and considering the comments in the special areas of general education and the major programs, the Committee feels that a statewide system of cross-registration would not serve students but certainly would impose additional problems on institutions, including the determination of FTE's.

The preceding report was accepted with the understanding that possible refinements of the recommendations and then their synthesis with other recommendations be the prerogative of the main committee. However, the main committee did pay considerable additional attention to certain suggested alternate mechanisms. An amplification of these deliberations is essential to this report.

Consideration of Alternate Mechanisms: Despite the fact that the subcommittee

studied and rejected certain other methods of improving transferability, some of these mechanisms were thought to warrant additional study by the main committee. The major thrust of the committee dealt with the feasibility of:

-a uniform general education program

-uniformity in major programs

-a uniform course numbering system

The committee, after considerable discussion, generally agreed with the stand taken by the subcommittee regarding the desirability of greater uniformity in general education and major programs -- and largely for the same reasons. It was pointed out, in addition to the desirability for "free enterprise" in these areas and the fact that some differences are desirable and do reflect dynamism, that these programs are presently very similar -- with this similarity being the characteristic, the differences incidental. Further, it was considered highly significant that there is a lack of evidence regarding student transferability problems in this area.

The implementation of a common course numbering system (at least at the lower division level), such as the one in use by the State of Florida, was explored in considerable detail. The Florida system appeared to hold possible solutions for a number of problem areas such as ease of credit transfer, institutional and state record keeping, enrollment pattern analyses, cost analyses, and the like. Nevertheless, the full committee ultimately did reject this alternative as undermining certain very desirable features of the present system in Kentucky. As a mechanism to ease the transferability problem, the benefits derived would not justify the cost. The reasons for the above decision must be noted.

1. The total effort expended to develop such a system is not

consistent with its probable goal achievement. To effect it would require at least the following:

a. the establishment of discipline committees representing most, if not all, of the colleges and universities having such major programs on their campuses so that they might try to reach an agreement with respect to course levels, content, and sequencing;

b. the establishment of a comparable committee representing each institution's general education interests which would have to accomplish the same taks as the aforementioned committee, but would have the additional responsibility of evaluating pure general education, non-discipline courses, as well as discipline-oriented general education courses;

c. the existence of a state level coordinating committee, with university representation, responsible for evaluating and recommending specific actions based upon the findings of the first committees;

d. legislative action;

e. the maintaining of standing committees in the major and general education program areas for monitoring and bringing about necessary future changes;

f. the employment of at least one full-time faculty/staff member on each campus to coordinate his campus's activities with those at the state level; and

g. a state office with adequate direction and staffing to monitor the program, effect required changes, and disseminate information.

These described activities would be in addition to those efforts required to change all course curricula data, catalogs, and other informational materials to adjust to the course numbering program.

2. The total effort described has to be supported by sufficient funding. The State of Florida reports expenditures of about one-half million dollars on the project to get it to the legislative level. It is granted that some of these efforts and mistakes may not have to be repeated by using their experience, but since the Kentucky educational system differs significantly enough from that of Florida, the reduction would not be as great as might be anticipated. Also the cost of monitoring this system must be evaluated.

3. The course numbering system, while it is designed to make record keeping and the transferring of credits routine, may, in fact, cloud the issue and result in confusion and departmental circumvention of its intent. This is so as the Florida document

clearly states that "the course numbering system is descriptive, not prescriptive ... courses may not be standardized." If this is true, courses with the same number, even if they start out fairly similar in content, may change significantly from one program to another, and the figures indicating the enrollment in Chemistry 254 may reflect only student enrollment, not the number of students sharing a common experience. Naturally, the ramifications of this system with respect to a department's evaluating prior program coursework at another institution are only to be speculated upon.

4. If, on the other hand, the course numbering system is meaningful, and if it can be assumed further that the composite structuring of courses developed in various disciplines could result in an initially perfect program (both difficult tasks), then the difficulties surrounding changes in programs as a result of new discipline information, faculty changes, changing employer expectations of program graduates, and the like, would be most difficult to achieve, for to achieve change would require a consensus on the part of all of the program directors in the state. It should be remembered that the major strength of the American system, whether it be in politics, business, sports, or in education, is the opportunity for enough unit freedom to permit experimentation, innovation, and the trial, development, and implementation of continually changing and improving products. Since the dissemination of information regarding a new program, in the case of the academic world, is readily brought about through professional meetings, the evaluation of this new program by sister institutions is almost automatic. Although this evaluation may not result in adoption, it often does result in additional improvement by the reviewing institution of their own programs.

Uniform Procedures for Assessing Nontraditional Educational Experiences and Programs:

Certain students attempting to transfer into degree programs will come from institutions that are not regionally accredited or will come with non-instituionalized competencies that should be evaluated. Therefore, these students present experiences or competencies for evaluation from nonacademic or nontraditional programs.

Currently, no uniform procedures exist for evaluating these experiences or competencies among the receiving institutions. The problem of assessing, evaluating and accrediting nontraditional academic programs also exists. However, this issue is currently being addressed by a Council on Postsecondary/ Accreditation (COPA) Committee which is attempting to study nontraditional education and the various emerging learning forms found in postsecondary educational institutions. The committee will also address the accreditation procedures necessary to determine the essential elements for developing the appropriate evaluative criteria for these programs.

The recognition that students are attempting to transfer into degree programs from these nonacademic or nontraditional programs necessitates the development of a set of uniform procedures for interpreting competencies learned in a nontraditional setting.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

The Study Group identified three primary problem areas and six secondary areas of concern for which recommendations will be made. The primary problem areas are the following:

1. There is a problem resulting from the lack of adequate program articulation between postsecondary institutions of different types -- particularly between postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions and the more traditional institutions.

2. There is a problem resulting from the lack of adequate individual course credit transfer and application toward degree programs between postsecondary institutions of different types -- particularly between postsecondary vocational or proprietary institutions and the more traditional institutions.

3. There is a problem resulting from the lack of uniformity among institutions in evaluating non-academic or non-traditional experiences or competencies for credit in degree programs.

The secondary areas of concern are:

1. the perceived transfer problem where students think they have lost credit when in fact the credits have been applied to different degree requirements, resulting in fewer electives the student may choose;

2. differences between general education program requirements from institution to institution;

3. differences between the requirements in the major field of study from institution to institution;

4. lack of 'ideal' advising of transfer students by both the sending and the receiving institutions*;

5. differences in institutional policies regarding the acceptance of 'D' grades, and;

6. differences in institutional policies regarding the acceptance of specific courses in a limited number of programs.

---

*In some cases this is through no fault of the sending institution, as students often transfer by simply leaving the prior college.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are submitted by the Student Transferability Study Group. Individually and collectively they are designed to modify the existing system to improve effectively the total transferability situation while maintaining the present, desirable procedures of the Kentucky state-supported and independent postsecondary educational institutions. The recommendations include the establishment of one entirely new mechanism at the state level, together with a number of procedural changes at the institutional level (some with state coordination) which will improve existing transfer mechanisms.

Statewide Articulation Committee: The principal recommendation of the Study Group is that the Council on Higher Education establish a Statewide Articulation Committee. This permanent committee would recommend policies and procedures to the Council for the improvement of program articulation and student transferability between the postsecondary institutions in the state.

The principal functions of the Statewide Articulation Committee would be to-

1. review existing policies and procedures and possibly recommend new policies and procedures to facilitate transferability of credit;

2. promote and review program articulation agreements among the various types of postsecondary institutions in Kentucky. (These types include public and private, two- and four-year institutions, state vocational/technical schools, and proprietary schools.)

Committee members should be appointed by the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education and be made up of fourteen members as follows:

-two representatives of the state postsecondary vocational/technical school system,
-two representatives of the University of Kentucky Community College System,
-one representative of proprietary schools and colleges,
-one representative of the independent junior colleges,

-two representatives of the independent four-year institutions,
-four representatives of the state-supported four-year institutions,
-one representative from the lay public, and,
-one student representative.

The members are to be appointed for three-year terms on a staggered basis, except for the annual appointment of the student representative.

The proposed duties of this committee are to -

1. study and evaluate transferability and program articulation issues;

2. promote and monitor program articulation agreements among the various types of postsecondary institutions in Kentucky;

3. review existing policies and mechanisms and develop new policies and mechanisms to facilitate the transfer of credits and the articulation of programs;

4. foster program articulation agreements between the postsecondary vocational/technical schools and the higher education institutions. Linkages also should be developed between the junior colleges, the community colleges, and the higher education institutions;

5. assure the student a minimum loss of credits by encouraging the development of "ladder" programs and "2 + 2" programs, and;

6. maintain lines of communication with those agencies and/or boards (such as State Board for Occupational Education, Accrediting Agencies, etc.) concerned with articulation at the postsecondary level.

The committee may facilitate its work by assigning articulation tasks in general education and educational specialties to its membership as needed. For each such task, the committee should appoint ad hoc committees made up of institutional representatives and representatives from appropriate accrediting and licensing agencies to study issues and to recommend solutions to the committee.

It is recognized that additional problem areas relating to articulation may arise and that it may be necessary to establish additional ad hoc committees; however, at this time, ad hoc committees in the areas of general education, transfer from state postsecondary vocational/technical schools to

degree-granting institutions, transfer from proprietary schools, and some specific program areas seem to be appropriate.

Supporting Recommendations: In addition to the establishment of the Statewide Articulation Committee, the following additional recommendations are designed to facilitate the transfer process.

1. All institutions are to develop course equivalency guides similar to those currently in use at many institutions. These manuals (a) should be developed between institutions having transfer activity in the past; (b) should be developed between institutions which should have or expect to have future transfers, and, (c) should ultimately result in including course equivalencies on a statewide basis. It is recommended that they should, at least, list lower division courses and chart the equivalent course or courses offered at those institutions. The process should not just state the equivalencies between courses, but should make clear which courses are accepted for transfer and which are not. It is envisioned that these guides would be of considerable value in disseminating information to prospective transfer students; would assist advisors in the advising process at the sending institutions, and; would improve the effectiveness of the transcript evaluation procedure at the receiving institutions. In the interim, however, transfer students may still have to be accommodated on an individual basis.

2. Each institution should have a mechanism for responding to articulation problems, such as a council, committee, or panel. As noted in the report of the subcommittee on general education and academic programs, the institutions of the state are effectively handling most transfer cases between similar institutions in a routine manner. While the first recommendation affords additional tools to improve this process, this recommendation is designed to permit the institutions to refine further their transfer policies and procedures and their academic counseling as well as to provide an avenue for student appeals.

3. A transferability guidebook should be compiled and maintained by the Council on Higher Education to explain the transferring process from both statewide and institutional perspectives. Specifically it should distinguish among the various types of postsecondary institutions and their purposes, goals, and accreditation. It should discuss transfer considerations resulting from these differences. The guidebook should summarize transfer policies and procedures and degree requirements as established by each Kentucky institution. It is further recommended, consistent with problems identified earlier in this report, that cautionary statements be included which point out the inherent difficulties when transferring

credits between institutions of different types with different missions. These guidebooks should be reasonably available at all institutions, and student handbooks at each institution should apprise the student of the existence of the guidebook when discussing transferring procedures.

4. The Study Group recommends that the institutions, with the cooperation of the Council on Higher Education and the State Board for Proprietary Education, develop mechanisms for the evaluation of credits from any college which is accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Office of Education and licensed to offer standard college degrees in Kentucky. Once these mechanisms are developed, they can be used to evaluate credit from other types of postsecondary institutions. Examples of such mechanisms follow:

   a. On-site evaluation (to review faculty, facilities, curriculum and other educational areas).

   b. Evaluation of the accreditation held to determine if the accreditation standards provide a quality measure of collegiate activity which may warrant acceptance of credit based on the level of accreditation the institution has attained. This measure may require input from the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the United States Office of Education, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and others knowledgeable in the measurement of accreditation.

   c. Challenge/proficiency exams (institutional, CLEP, CPEP, etc.)

   d. Credit-in-Escrow (hold transfer courses "in escrow" until the student has successfully completed courses at the receiving institution, then grant credit for the transfer course.)

APPENDIX A

AGENDA ITEM D-2

STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

AGENDA ITEM: D-2

Exec. Dir.

# STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Council appoint a study group on student transferability. This study group will include institutional members and representatives of other appropriate groups. The purpose of the group will be to study the current issues concerning student transfers between institutions, to review institutional policies and procedures related to student transfers and to consider mechanisms for improving the transferability of students. These mechanisms could include:

1. Establishment of articulation committees comprised of the institutions' articulation specialists to provide the structure and continuity for efficient and rational transfer of credits between institutions.
2. Transfer information data banks for effective statewide articulation of programs.
3. A statewide system of undergraduate and graduate cross-registration for programs at all institutions.
4. Uniform policies for general education courses to assure minimum loss of credit and course repetition for students moving between institutions.
5. Standards for degree requirements at the departmental level that will minimize loss of credit and course repetition for academic majors moving between institutions.
6. Amendment of residency requirements for graduate programs to allow for reasonable transferability of credits.

It is further recommended that the Council invite the independent institutions and the state potsecondary vocational schools to participate in this project to provide for the most comprehensive transferability of students between institutions.

Based upon the report of the study group, the Council staff will prepare policies and procedures for the statewide transferability of students. These policies and procedures, along with the study group's report, will be presented to the Council for consideration at the meeting in October, 1977.

APPENDIX B

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE DEGREE

IN PRINTING TECHNOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATE OF
SCIENCE DEGREE IN PRINTING TECHNOLOGY

This proposed Associate of Science Degree in Printing Technology is a 64-hour program to be offered cooperatively by the Bowling Green and Somerset State Vocational-Technical Schools and Western Kentucky University.

To be admitted students must hold a diploma from an accredited high school or equivalent, must be satisfactorily enrolled in the Somerset or Bowling Green Vocational-Technical School printing program and be certified for enrollment by the area vocational-technical school program administration.

Students successfully completing the program of study requirements for the respective printing programs in the State Vocational-Technical schools (usually 2,640 clock hours or approximately two years) will be awarded a block of 24 semester hours credit toward the Associate of Science Degree in Printing Technology at Western Kentucky University.

Students must maintain a grade point average of 2.0 (on a four point system) in the 40-hour block of college courses.

At least 28 hours of the 40-hour block of college courses must be taken at Western. All of the Industrial Education and Technology courses must be taken at Western.

The college courses may be taken concurrently with the vocational school work or may be completed subsequent to completion of the technical program. College courses must be selected in consultation with and approved by the student's WKU advisor, otherwise they may not count toward the 40-hour college credit block.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF STUDIES

| | Semester Hours |
|---|---|
| Technical credit allowed from Somerset or Bowling Green Vocational-Technical Schools | 24 |
| Industrial Education and Technology | 12 |
| Required | |
| 110 Industrial Safety - 3 | |



(over)

Electives (select 9 hours)
- 102 Engineering Drafting - 3
- 108 Intro. Fluid Power - 3
- 120 Basic Electricity - 3
- 214 Adv. Engineering Drafting - 3
- 275 Graphic Layout and Repro. - 3
- 280 Numerical Cont. Syst. - 3
- 285 Color Separation - 3
- 307 Process Photography - 3
- 315 Airbrush Rendering - 3
- 316 Tech. Illustration - 3
- 380 Indpt. Study Graphics - 3
- 405 Printing - 3

Related Electives (select 6 hours) 6
- Mass Comm 229 Print Design, Prod. and Typography - 3
- Mass Comm 237 Basic Photography - 3
- Mass Comm 282 Principles of Advertising - 3
- BE&OA 142 Fund. and Appl. of Data Processing - 3

Organization and Communication of Ideas 6
- English 101 Freshman English - 3
- English 207 Technical Writing - 3

Humanities Elective 3

Social and Behav. Studies 6

Natural Science and Math 7
- Math 100 Intermediate Algebra - 4
- Phy. 103 Light, Color and Vision - 3

Approved:

College of Education Curriculum Committee October 7, 1976

Associate Degree and Certificate Committee October 19, 1976

Academic Council December 14, 1976

APPENDIX C

COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY STUDY GROUP AGENDA -- JUNE 13, 1977

COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
STUDENT TRANSFERABILITY STUDY GROUP
June 13, 1977

# A G E N D A

10:00 - 12:30
Welcome and Introductions
Purpose of the Study
General Discussion Items:

1.) Institutional policies and procedures on transferability (exchange of documents)

2.) Current status of academic counseling of transfer students by sending and receiving institutions

3.) The feasibility of:

a.) Agenda Item D-2 Mechanisms:

1. Articulation Committees
2. Transfer information data banks
3. Statewide system of cross-registration
4. Uniform policies for general education courses to assure minimum loss of credit and course repetitions
5. Standards for degree requirements at the departmental level that will minimize loss of credit and course repetition for academic majors
6. Amendment of residency requirements for graduate programs to allow reasonable transfer of credits

b.) Statewide standardized course numbering system and common transcript form

c.) Statewide handbook on transferability of credit including course equivalency charts

4.) Current role of accrediting agencies relative to student transferability

5.) Other discussion items??

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 Continuation of Discussion

3:00 - 3:15 Break

3:15 - 4:00 Determination of follow-up activities, writing assignments, next meeting, etc.

4:00 Adjournment

# APPENDIX D

## TRANSFER STUDENT INFORMATION

JUL 05 1977

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

Office of the Dean
of Scholastic Development

July 1, 1977

Robert E. Carter
Assistant Director for Planning
Council on Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Bob:

I have completed the research which was assigned at our recent meeting of the Student Transferability Study Group. I have analyzed the records of the May, 1977, graduates who have received the baccalaureate degree from Western Kentucky University. We had a total of 1,057 graduates.

In keeping with our agreement, I selected all students who had transferred 32 semester hours or more to Western. This included both the initial transfer and any subsequent work. I included only students transferring from other Kentucky institutions. It is our policy at Western to place all courses, hours, and grades on the Western transcript when a student transfers to our institution. Therefore, I have examined the complete record.

Attachment I compares the number of hours earned by transfers with the number of hours earned by those who did not transfer. In looking at the non-transfer group, I selected at random a 25 percent sample. You will also notice that the transfer students have been subdivided into four groups to determine if there was any difference in students who transfer from certain types of institutions.

Even though the group of transfer students in this study graduated with slightly fewer hours than did the non-transfer students, we analyzed each individual transcript for the four groups of transfer students. The hours earned above the absolute minimum of 128 seemed to fall in the following categories:

1. Extra electives were taken.
2. An additional major or minor was taken.
3. A change in career plans and/or major had occurred.
4. Extra hours were taken in either the major or minor.

5. The program of study chosen required 132 or 135 semester hours for all students rather than the absolute minimum of 128.

6. In a few instances, one or two extra courses were taken because the student had earned credit at the first institution in a course which was not offered by Western. For example, the student may have earned credit in a non-baccalaureate degree course, or in a technical course, or in a Bible course which was over and above the amount of special work allowed for our regular students.

I will be at the next meeting of the study group and will be happy to further explain what we have done and try to answer any questions which may have resulted from our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Ronnie N. Sutton

Ronnie N. Sutton
Dean of Scholastic Development

RNS/bjb

Attachment

cc: President Dero Downing

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
1977 MAY GRADUATES

Kentucky Transfers

| | Group | Number | Hours Earned |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. | 2 Year Community Colleges (Public) | 67 | 137.57 |
| B. | 2 Year Colleges (Private) | 17 | 133.61 |
| C. | 4 Year Colleges (Public) | 41 | 136.46 |
| D. | 4 Year Colleges (Private) | 16 | 136.05 |
| | Total | 141 | 136.50 |

Non-Transfers

| Group | Number | Hours Earned |
|---|---|---|
| Twenty-five Percent Sample | 252 | 137.2 |

JUN 28 1977

**Murray State University**

Dean of Admissions and Registrar
Murray, Kentucky 42071
Telephone (502) 762-3741

June 27, 1977

SUBJECT: RESEARCH ON MAY 1977 GRADUATES AT MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

TO: Robert E. Carter
Assistant Director for Planning

FROM: Wilson Gantt
Dean of Admissions and Registrar

In response to the assignment of the research section of the Student Transferability Study Group, I have inspected the records of the May 14 graduates who received the baccalaureate degree. In this study:

1. A transfer is one who transferred 32 semester hours or more to Murray. (This includes both the initial transfer and any subsequent work, if any.)
2. Only transfers from institutions within the state of Kentucky were considered.
3. If a student had attended more than one school, the last attended prior to initial entry was considered the source.
4. All hours earned from any regionally accredited institution are a part of the record and included in the total statistics.
5. All students in the May 14 graduation who met the criteria are included in the report.
6. Nontransfers are defined as those who have done all of their work at Murray or have transferred in with less than one full year (32 semester hours).

MEAN SEMESTER HOURS CREDIT AT TIME OF GRADUATION

| NUMBER | TYPE | |
|---|---|---|
| 360 | Nontransfers | 135.1 Semester Hours |
| 72 | Transfers from Kentucky Colleges | 135.9 Semester Hours |

TRANSFERS BY TYPE OF COLLEGES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 58 | Community College System (Public) | 135.7 Semester Hours |
| 0 | Junior College (Private) | |
| 9 | 4 year Institutiors (Public) | 136.6 Semester Hours |
| 5 | 4 Year Institutiors (Private) | 137.2 Semester Hours |

It should be clearly understood that these means are skewed rather sharply in all groups by:

1. Those who changed majors rather late.

2. Those who voluntarily took overloads to get courses they wanted but were not required.

3. Those who completed additional majors or minors beyond that required for graduation.

cle

cc: Jerry R. Franklin
Jerry Legere
Ronnie N. Sutton

JUN 27 1977

# MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY 40351

OFFICE OF
THE REGISTRAR

June 24, 1977

Mr. Robert E. Carter
Council on Public Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Bob:

I have just completed the research study of our May, 1977, graduates, comparing the average total number of hours completed by our graduates who have transferred from another Kentucky institution to the average total number of hours completed by a random sample of the same number of graduates who completed all of their work at Morehead State University. I am enclosing a breakdown of the findings of this study. As you will notice, the average total hours completed by our transfer graduates is 137.7 compared to 132.6 for those graduates who completed all of their work at Morehead. Since we agreed going in that 6 hours would be a significant difference, the 5.1 difference at Morehead would not therefore constitute a difference of significant proportion. Further, if you look at the transfers from two-year institutions only, and I believe this is our major concern, you will see that the difference was only about 3 total hours. I don't believe that this could in any way be construed as a significant difference and therefore a problem area.

If you have questions concerning these findings or how we arrived at them, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

Jerry R. Franklin

Jerry R. Franklin
Registrar

JRF:nf

copies to: Dr. Ronnie N. Sutton

Mr. Jerry Legere

Mr. Wilson Gantt

Enclosure

# M O R E H E A D  S T A T E  U N I V E R S I T Y

May, 1977, Graduates
Who Transferred to MSU
From Another KY Institution

BREAKDOWN

| | Total Number | Average Total Hours |
|---|---|---|
| 2 year Community Colleges | 31 | 135.8 |
| 2 year Private Colleges | 4 | 135.5 |
| 4 year Public Colleges | 9 | 137.7 |
| 4 year Private Colleges | 8 | 146.1 |
| Totals | 52 | 137.7 |

Random Sample of May, 1977, Graduates
Who Completed all Work at MSU

| Total Number | Average Total Hours |
|---|---|
| 52 | 132.6 |

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRAR

July 6, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Carter
Assistant Director for Planning

FROM: Jerry Legere
Associate Registrar for Student Records

SUBJECT: Comparison of Transfer and Non Transfer May 1977 Graduates

As requested, I have reviewed a sample of our May 1977 graduates for study purposes. This past semester 1482 undergraduate degrees were awarded. From this group I decided to sample a third of the graduates from two colleges, Arts and Sciences and Business and Economics. Although 669 graduated, I reviewed 225 roughly 34%. I chose these two colleges because they both require the minimum 120 hours for a degree. Had I sampled other colleges which require 128 or more hours, then the study would not have been fair or representative. The following criteria was used in the study:

1) A transfer was defined as having 30 or more semester hours from another school.
2) Only Kentucky residents were considered in this study.
3) If a student attended more than one school, then the school transferring the most hours was considered.
4) Non transfers are defined as those who did all of their work at UK or who did a minimal amount at another school (six hours or less).

Average Semester Hours Credit at Time of Graduation

| Number of Students | Type | Average Hours at Graduation |
|---|---|---|
| 142 | Non Transfers | 124.75 |
| 83 | Transfer Students | 128.67 |

Transfers by Type of Institutions

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 48 | Community College | 127.48 |
| 18 | 4 Year Public | 130.56 |
| 17 | 4 Year Private | 130.06 |
| 0 | 2 Year Private | 0 |

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

It must be understood that in looking at these figures they are only averages. The range for each category was the following:

1) the range for community college transfer students was 120 to 156.
2) the range for transfer students from 4 year public schools was 120 to 167.
3) the range for transfer students from 4 year private schools was 122 to 164.

JL:pke

cc: Dr. Ronnie Sutton
Jerry Franklin
Wilson Gantt

# APPENDIX E

## STUDY GROUP MEMBERSHIP

STUDY GROUP MEMBERSHIP

State-Supported Institutions

Dr. Joseph R. Schwendeman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky 40475
606/622-3047

Mrs. Mabel J. Henderson
Dean of Academic Services
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-6206

Mr. Jerry Franklin
Registrar
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky 40351
606/783-3120

Mr. Wilson Gantt
Dean of Admissions and Registrar
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071
502/762-3741

Mr. Jim Alfred
Associate Provost for Educational Services
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076
606/292-5403

Dr. Stephen Langston
Assistant Vice President for Continuing Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
606/257-2881

Ms. Marie Piekarski
Coordinator of Program Planning and Development
Breckinridge Hall, Room 211
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
606/258-5900

Betty Brafford
Professor of Chemistry
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40208
502/588-6522

Dr. Ronnie N. Sutton
Dean for Scholastic Development
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101
502/745-4241

Independent Institutions

Dr. Jude D. Weisenbeck
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Brescia College
Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
502/685-3131 ext. 251

Dr. William E. Hovenden
Dean of the College
Alice Lloyd College
Pippa Passes, Kentucky 41844
606/368-2101 ext. 237

Kentucky Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

Mr. Jerry Legere
Associate Registrar for Student Records
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
606/257-4623

State Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Schools

Mr. Robert E. Spillman
Director
Program Supporting Services Division
Bureau of Vocational Education
Department of Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-3096

Ms. Martha Raymer
Regional Director
Vocational Education Region IV (Barren River)
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101
502/781-3854

Proprietary Institutions

Mr. A. R. Sullivan
President
Sullivan Junior College of Business
Sullivan Centre Campus
Watterson Expressway at Bardstown Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40205
502/451-0841

Council on Higher Education

Dr. Robert E. Carter
Coordinator of Statewide Planning
Council on Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-5483

Mrs. Sue McDade
Higher Education Specialist
Council on Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-3576

Mr. Woodson Reynolds
Higher Education Specialist
Council on Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-5483

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.

MAR 23 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES